DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 335 736 EA 023 163

AUTHOR Hargreaves, Andy
TITLE Restructuring Restructuring: Postmodernity and the Prospects for Educational Change.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 35p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; *Educational Change; Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Excellence in Education; Instructional Design; Participative Decisionmaking; *School Organization; *School Restructuring

ABSTRACT

Change by school restructuring has followed quickly on the heels of school reform that sought to mandate improvement upon teachers by bureaucratic control and compliance. It did not take long for problems of the reform paradigm to surface as teacher improvement could not be mandated. A complete restructuring of teaching and learning organization was called for. Two possible scenarios in restructuring include meeting needs for new educational structures to generate new skills and qualities in a postindustrial society. Restructuring involves many choices and dilemmas. One of the key restructuring tensions is the orchestration of educational vision. More controversy arises from tension between mandates and menus as preferred ways of delivering and developing educational improvement. A dilemma also arises in choosing between investing trust in people or in processes as the establishment of trust is central to restructuring. A fourth tension is between using school structure or culture as the proper focus for change. (58 references) (EJS)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED335736

# RESTRUCTURING RESTRUCTURING: POSTMODERNITY AND THE PROSPECTS FOR EDUCATIONAL CHANGE *

Andy Hargreaves
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Hargreaves

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

*This paper has benefited from valuable comments and feedback from my colleagues Sandra Acker, Michael Fullan and Ken Leithwood

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 023 163

## Introduction

In 1986, the Carnegie Forum on "Education and the Economy," in their report, ***A Nation Prepared***, announced the need to "restructure schools."[1] This restructuring, it was thought, would respect and support the professionalism of teachers to make decisions in their own classrooms that best met local and state goals, while also holding teachers accountable for how they did that.

In this article, I will examine some of the meanings of restructuring, along with a number of key choices and dilemmas that restructuring poses for educators, particularly with regard to teacher development and professional growth. The paper begins by distinguishing restructuring from its antecedent of educational reform. Two different scenarios of restructuring are then explored, as represented by the writings of Sarason and Schlechty. Together, it is argued, these scenarios highlight tensions in restructuring between bureaucracy and professionalism. Such tensions , I go on to show, are not specific to education but are rooted in wider tensions in society as a whole as it moves into the restructured era of postmodernity. Finally, the implications of these tensions in restructuring for educators are explored in the form of four fundamental dilemmas between:

- vision and voice,
- mandates and menus,
- trust in persons and trust in processes,
- structure and culture.

## The Context and Meaning of Restructuring

Change by ***restructuring*** has followed quickly on the heels of change by ***reform*** which sought to mandate improvement upon teachers by bureaucratic control and compliance, rather than supporting teachers to improve themselves and creating restructured opportunities for them in

ways that respected their professionalism. Within the era of reform, the United States placed substantial emphasis on teacher certification and on basic competency tests for teachers. In many states and school districts, initiatives to motivate the teaching force followed through such measures as merit pay, career ladders and differentiated staffing. In the United Kingdom, central controls over teacher preparation were exerted at the national level through procedures of accreditation for teacher education programs. These accredited programs devoted more attention to practical teaching experience and subject matter mastery, and by implication, less attention to critical reflection on the purposes, ethics and social consequences of different versions of teaching.[2] In 1988, a newly legislated teacher contract also enumerated the number of hours for which teachers would be minimally contracted including what was termed 'directed time' out of class: to be directed according to the wishes of the headteacher or principal.

Within the context of change through reform, measures designed to motivate teachers were paralleled by ones aimed at improving curriculum and instruction. In the United Kingdom, the increased prominence given to subject matter knowledge in teacher education, and the governmental imposition of a subject-based National Curriculum, betrayed a shift from broad sponsorship of teachers and school self-education, self-evaluation and critical reflection to training and induction in contents and principles already determined elsewhere—at the national level.[3] In the United States, many career ladder and teacher leadership programs selected, rewarded and evaluated teachers not according to multiple criteria of excellence and professional growth, but according to those teachers' adherence to approved models of instruction, often ones that placed a premium on mastery of basic skills.[4] In these cases, the reform of teaching and the reform of instruction went together. Teacher development was not self development. It was development directed toward the goals of others within a bureaucratic context of regulation and control.

It did not take long for problems of the reform paradigm to surface. It underestimated the divisive effects of career ladders among teachers, misunderstood the basis of teacher motivation as one rooted not in extrinsic career 'carrots' but in intrinsic work rewards, and did not appreciate that

because of teachers' control over the sanctuaries of their own classrooms, teacher improvement could not be mandated by bureaucratic control. More than this, as the United States debt crisis mounted, and the responsiveness of the corporate world to global competitiveness began to look sluggish, there were growing concerns that young people leaving high school needed more than the traditional minimum competences and basic skills that had preoccupied reformers' thinking hitherto. Problem-solving, higher order thinking skills, risk-taking, teamwork and cooperation: these were emerging as the skills and competencies that young people would require as America entered the global information society. Tinkering and quick-fixes within the bounds of the existing system, it seemed, could not bring about significant improvements even in terms of the basic skills and academic achievements that comprised the traditional goals of schooling. Certainly, they could not meet the still greater educational challenges now being posed by the new information society. Reform within the bounds of the existing system was not enough. Something more fundamental was called for: nothing short of a complete ***restructuring*** of the organization of teaching and learning to meet the challenges of the twenty-first century.

In the space of just a few years, restructuring has become common currency in educational policy vocabulary, right up to the office of President in the United States and among Ministers and civil servants in other national and regional policy contexts too.[5] Yet its meanings are various, conflicting and often ill-defined. As Tyack observes, where restructuring is concerned, vague is vogue.[6]

The possible components of restructuring are many and various. According to Murphy & Evertson, they comprise school-based management, increased consumer choice, teacher empowerment and teaching for understanding.[7] For the National Governors' Association, they include curriculum and instruction redesigned to promote higher order thinking skills; the decentralization of authority and decision-making to site level; more diverse and differentiated roles for teachers; and broadened systems of accountability.[8] While the specific components of restructuring vary from one writer to another, most seem to agree that what is centrally involved is a fundamental redefinition of rules, roles, responsibilities and relationships for

teachers and leaders in our schools.[9] Beyond this point, though, the desire for consensus about and commitment to restructuring in general has left its specific meaning inchoate.

But the broader meanings of restructuring are not infinite. While the particulars vary from scheme to scheme, certain general patterns of restructuring are becoming evident which embody quite distinct principles of power and control and which serve very different purposes. Two scenarios of restructuring offer an initial flavour of some of the important contrasts here.

The first is drawn from Seymour Sarason's account of ***The Predictable Failure of Educational Reform***.[10] Sarason argues that by the criterion of classroom impact, most educational reform has failed. This failure, he says, is predictable. He identifies two factors as responsible for this. First, he notes that the different components of educational reform have neither been conceived nor addressed as a whole, in their interrelationships, as a complex system. If components like curriculum change, or professional development, or new teaching strategies are tackled in isolation while others are left unchanged, the success of the reforms will almost certainly be undermined. Sarason supplies numerous historical examples of such failed reforms. That such patterns are not merely a matter of historical record, but persist as a chronic feature of our present systems, is strikingly revealed in recent studies of the implementation of manipulative problem-solving approaches to mathematics teaching in California.[11] These evaluations show that teachers commonly fail to implement the programs because of the persistence of other programs that emphasize direct instruction in basic skills, and because the dominant forms of evaluation and testing continue to be of a conventional, paper and pencil kind. Sarason's argument has two important implications. First, significant change in curriculum, assessment or any other domain is unlikely to be successful unless serious attention is also paid to teacher development and the principles of professional judgement and discretion contained within it. Second, teacher development and enhanced professionalism must also be undertaken in conjunction with developments in curriculum, assessment, leadership, and school organization.

Sarason's second and arguably more radical contention, is that major educational change is unlikely to be successful unless it addresses school power relationships. "Schools... remain intractable to desired reform as long as we avoid confronting their existing power relationships," he argues.[12] These include relationships between administrators and teachers, between teachers and parents and between teachers and students. Sarason argues for a radical rethink of how schools and classrooms are run. His vision of restructuring entails change that is comprehensive in scope, accompanied by significant, not superficial redistributions of existing power relationships among principals, teachers, parents and students. It is a vision that is rooted in a sociopsychological understanding of human motivation and commitment, and in a sociopolitical understanding of schools as places not only devoted to teaching and learning, but also defined through relationships of power and control. Restructuring means redefining these relationships in fundamental ways.

In a second scenario, Philip Schlechty also sets out a comprehensive restructuring agenda.[13] Like Sarason, Schlechty's advocacy of restructuring springs from a concern about the inappropriateness of most school structures for the needs of modern society. With their single classroom, single lesson, single teacher formats, such structures are more suited to late nineteenth and early twentieth century preoccupations with mass education in basic skills, and with rigid educational selection for future work roles that are expected to remain fixed over time, than to the complex needs of the post-industrial order.

Both Schlechty and Sarason see a need for new skills and qualities in post-industrial society, and for new structures to generate them. Sarason defines these in a socially and politically broad way. For him they are the skills and problem solving capacities needed to cope with and respond to a complex, changing and threatened social world. They are cultural and political skills as well as occupational ones. For Schlechty, though, the purposes of education in the 21st century are driven by more specifically corporate concerns. For him, the challenge is that of the global information society. Children are construed as "knowledge-workers" and schools are defined as being in the business of "knowledge- work."

> "It is reasonable to expect that, as the American economy becomes more information based, and as the mode of labour shifts from manual work to knowledge work, concern with the continuous growth and learning of citizens and employees will increase. Moreover, the conditions of work will require one to learn to function well in groups, exercise considerable self-discipline, exhibit loyalty while maintaining critical faculties, respect the rights of others and in turn expect to be respected.... This list of characteristics could as well be a list of the virtues of a citizen in a democracy."[14]

While many of these contents are similar to Sarason's, the corporate context of Schlechty's agenda nonetheless narrows the range of the qualities and characteristics thought appropriate as outcomes in the schools of the future. There is talk of respect, but not of care—either for other persons or for the environment. Justice and equity are also absent. Productivity is paramount. This doesn't distort, but it does restrict what it is seen as appropriate for schools to do.

The corporate context of Schlechty's advocacy has especially striking implications for his views of power and leadership in restructured schools. Participatory leadership *is* advocated but not on the grounds of truth, beauty or justice. The grounds of organizational effectiveness are the ones that are invoked. While, superficially, Schlechty appears to support changes in power relationships, in practice it is only the "symbols of power" that are to be rearranged. Much of the mechanics of leadership may change but ultimately control of the organization is vested in "strong leaders"; leaders who are the architects of their organizations' visions.

This is a view of power and leadership that is quite different from Sarason's more democratic view and is instead deeply rooted in the corporate perspective. Schlechty advises administrators to read more widely outside education, but all the references he lists are in the corporate and economic domain. Moral philosophy, organizational politics and human development are excluded from that list. Moreover, he instructs his readers that "those who are leading the restructuring schools and those who are leading the

restructuring of America's enterprises are in the same business."[15] Restructuring for Schlechty is therefore restructuring in a corporate context—corporate in its proposed structures for schooling and corporate in its desired outcomes for learning. This corporate perspective gives Schlechty a limited purchase on power relationships and teacher empowerment—one where bold rhetoric disguises balder realities; where professional growth is subsumed in a framework of administrative control.

Together these two scenarios remind us that there is nothing inevitably good or inherently bad about restructuring. Much depends upon who controls it, who is involved in it, and the purposes to which it is to be put. The agenda of restructuring comprises many important dilemmas, dilemmas that involve profound ethical and political choices about values and purposes.

At the heart of these is a fundamental choice between restructuring as bureaucratic control, where teachers are controlled and regulated to implement the mandates of others, and restructuring as professional empowerment, where teachers are supported, encouraged and provided with newly structured opportunities to make improvement of their own, in partnership with parents, principals and students. Our wish for consensus and our desire to maintain the momentum of change often deflects us from addressing these fundamental and difficult dilemmas. Yet if we do not grapple with them ourselves and resolve them to our own satisfaction, others will only resolve them for us later and perhaps in ways that jar with and undermine our own values and commitments. In the remainder of this paper, I want to scratch beneath the current consensus of restructuring, and expose the dilemmas of value, of purpose and of control which I believe we must now confront and resolve as we meet the educational challenges of the coming century.

## Dilemmas of Restructuring

Restructuring involves many choices and dilemmas. Some of these, like the choice between centralization and decentralization are familiar ones and have already been widely discussed. Here I want to review what I consider to be four equally important but less widely discussed dilemmas of restructuring; ones that have powerful implications for the purposes of restructuring and the directions it will take, as well as for the processes of teacher development contained within it. We shall see that tensions between bureaucracy and professionalism run through all of these.

### 1. Vision or Voice?

One of the key tensions in restructuring is between vision and voice. It is not specific to restructuring in education, but has its roots in the restructuring of contemporary society more generally.

There is a burgeoning literature now on the transitions currently being experienced within and across many societies from industrial to post-industrial, modern to postmodern, or liberal to post-liberal forms. The outcome of these transitions is, for most analysts, uncertain. As the prefix 'post' itself suggests, there is more clarity about what we are moving beyond than what we are moving towards.[16] Most writers agree, though, that at the heart of the transition is the globalization of information, communication and technology[17]. With it has come a compression of time and space and an increase in the pace of productivity and decision-making. Computerization along with satellite communication and fibre optic telecommunications have made international trading in information and currency markets ceaseless. Turnover time of goods and services has increased and economic corporations have been able to spread their interests and expertise across national boundaries, utilizing local markets, labour resources and land opportunities, and maintaining instantaneous connection and coordination across the whole network of operations through modern communications technology.

The globalization of trade and of economic activity is weakening the significance of national boundaries as the world reorganizes into a smaller

number of larger, more robust, economic units. By the end of 1992, all customs and trade barriers will have been removed in the European Economic Community. The once unthinkable goal of a common European currency has been agreed in principle. And the opening of the Channel Tunnel will merely complete a physical and technological union that will already have been achieved economically. Free Trade agreements already secured between the United States and Canada and soon to include Mexico, have similarly elevated economic unity and flexibility above national identity on the other side of the Atlantic.

In many respects, the globalization of economic life is coming to mean that the nation state as a separate economic, political and cultural entity is under threat and in decline. In response to these threats, attempts have emerged to protect and reconstruct national identities, not least through the development of national curricula as described by Goodson, in which elements of national culture and heritage figure strongly.[18]

Goodson sees within the reassertion of traditional academic subjects within the National Curriculum of England and Wales, an attempt to revive and reconstruct a floundering national identity.

> "The globalization of economic life, and more particularly of communication, information and technology, all pose enormous challenges to the existing modes of control and operation of nation-states. In this sense, the pursuance of new centralized national curriculum might be seen as the response of the more economically endangered species among nations.[19]

Dealing with the specific case of history, he continues.

> [T]he balance of subjects in the national curriculum suggest (*sic*) that questions of national identity and control have been pre-eminent, rather than industrial or commercial requirements. For example, information technology has been

> largely omitted, whilst history has been embraced as a "foundation subject", even though it is quite clearly a subject in decline within the schools.[20]

This is particularly so, he argues, given the high emphasis accorded to British history within the history curriculum. British history; Canadian content—these are the stuff of national cultural reconstruction, where the burden of reinvented traditions is placed, like most other social burdens, on the shoulders of education. More important still, as globalization intensifies, as MacDonald's opens in Moscow and sushi bars prosper in New York, as international urban landscapes become ever more alike in the global commodification of community living, we are witnessing the resurgence of ethnic, religious and linguistic identities of a more localized nature. The quest to reconstruct meaningful identities and attachments in the face of globalization can be seen in the struggles of Latvians, Lithuanians and Estonians to secure secession from the Soviet Union. It can also be seen on Canadian soil, in the collapse of the Meech Lake Accord, in the fights of francophones to secure recognition for themselves as a distinct society and for the province of Quebec as a politically autonomous unit, and in the struggles of First Nation peoples for self-determination as a 'nation-within-a-nation'.

What are we witnessing here is the emergence in the context of postmodernity of the voices of those who have previously been unheard, neglected, rejected, ignored—the voices of those who have formerly been marginalized and dispossessed. Gilligan's influential book, ***In a Different Voice***, draws attention to the undervalued women's perspective on moral development, for instance.[21] As Harvey puts it,

> "The idea that all groups have a right to speak for themselves, in their own voice accepted as authentic and legitimate is essential to the pluralistic stance of postmodernism."[22]

In educational change and educational research, the formerly unheard or undervalued teacher's voice has been accorded increasing respect and authority in recent years. And here, especially in elementary schools, the teacher's voice is also usually the woman's voice. Elbaz notes how much of

the emergent work on teachers' knowledge, thinking and empowerment is centrally concerned with the notion of voice. Where the notion of voice is used, she says, "the term is always used against the background of a previous silence, and it is a political usage as well as an epistemological one."[23] Goodson argues that teachers' voices are rooted in their lives, their lifestyles and their point in the lifecycle.[24] The teacher's voice, says Goodson, articulates the teacher's life and its purposes. To understand teaching, therefore, either as a researcher, an administrator, or a colleague, it is not enough merely to witness the behaviour, skills and actions of teaching. One must also listen to the voice of the teacher, to the person it expresses and to the purposes it articulates. Failure to understand the teacher's voice is failure to understand the teacher's teaching. For this reason, our priority should be not merely to listen to the teacher's voice, but also to sponsor it as a priority within our teacher development work.

Yet, the rise of dissident voices threatens traditional centres of power and control. Struggles for regional autonomy and linguistic or ethnic separatism, for instance, challenge long-standing patterns of central domination. Similarly, in education, the bureaucratic impetus to guide the process of change and improvement from the centre may lead the teacher's voice that doubts the change or disagrees with it to go unheard, or be silenced, or be dismissed as 'mere' resistance. In this respect, as the forces of bureaucratic control and teacher development wrestle with one another, one of the greatest challenges to the emergence of teacher ***voice***, is the orchestration of educational ***vision***.

The development of a common vision, commitment to shared goals or developing clarity in understanding the goals being implemented by others, are commonly advocated components of the change and improvement process. They are seen as essential to developing confidence and consistency among a community of teachers. Educational leaders are viewed as vital to the development of motivating visions. According to Achilles, for instance, leaders

> "must know what is needed to improve schools. They must know how to administer the schools to achieve the desired

> results. As a starting point, principals must envision better schools, articulate this vision to others, and orchestrate consensus on the vision."[25]

There is a strong sense here that the vision is primarily the principal's vision, a vision to be articulated to (not developed with) others, a vision around which the orchestration of consensus will follow later.

These criticisms are not intended to dispute the importance of vision, of shared purpose and direction among a school's staff. The crucial question, though, is 'whose vision is this?' For some writers, the principal's role in promoting school improvement and helping develop the culture of the school becomes one of manipulating the culture and its teachers to conform to the principal's own vision. Deal and Peterson, for example, urge that once principals have come to understand their school's culture, they should then ask, "If it matches my conception of a 'good school', what can I do to reinforce or strengthen existing patterns?' "If my vision is at odds with the existing mindset, values or ways of acting, what can be done to change or shape the culture?"[26] For Deal and Peterson, who write very much from a corporate perspective, this is part of the solution to the challenge of school leadership. In many respects, though, it can be seen as part of the problem.

The corporate folly of vision building being spearheaded by strong and single-minded leaders is revealed in an account of how Air Canada's new president, Claude Taylor, tried to turn the company around.

> "To show the new way, Taylor wrote a mission statement for the airline, framed it on his private meeting room wall and sent a copy to every employee's home."[27]

Part of the solution? Or part of the problem?

'My company', 'my vision', 'my teachers', 'my school'—these proprietary claims and attitudes suggest an ownership of the school and of change which is individual rather than collective, imposed rather than earned, and hierarchical rather than democratic. This ownership is also most usually male ownership, in which power is exercised over women. With

***visions*** as singular as this, teachers soon learn to suppress their ***voice***. Management becomes manipulation. Collaboration become cooptation. Worst of all, having teachers conform to the principal's vision minimizes the opportunities for principals to learn that parts of their own vision may be flawed; that some teachers' visions may be as valid or more valid than theirs!

This does not mean that principals' visions are unimportant. The quality and clarity of their visions may have helped mark them out for leadership. But principals have no monopoly on wisdom. Nor should they be immune from the questioning, inquiry and deep reflection in which we have asked teachers to engage. Principals' visions should therefore be provisional visions: ones that are open to change. They should be part of the collaborative mix. The authority of principals' views should not be presumed because of whose views they are, but because of their quality and richness.

Ultimately, the responsibility for vision-building should be a collective, not an individual one. Collaboration should mean creating the vision together, not complying with the principal's own. All stakeholders should be involved in illuminating the mission and purposes of the school. Leithwood and Jantzi describe a practical example of developing shared school goals for school improvement, where the responsibility for the task was delegated to school improvement teams. This, they note "prevented the principal's goals from dominating the process", although the authors add ominously in parentheses—"or from being seen to dominate the process"![28]

Exclusive emphasis on vision or voice alone is constructive neither for restructuring in general nor for professional development in particular. A world of voice without vision is a world reduced to chaotic babble where there are no means for arbitrating between voices, reconciling them or drawing them together. This is the dark side of the postmodern world, a world from which community and authority have disappeared. It is a world where the authority of voice has supplanted the voice of authority to an excessive degree. Research studies which go beyond merely understanding teachers' stories to endorsing and celebrating them, and research traditions which give arbitrary credence to teacher accounts over (neglected) accounts of

parents or students, for instance, illustrate some of the difficulties of this postmodern perspective. Voices need to be not only heard, but also engaged, reconciled and argued with. It is important to attend not only to the aesthetics of articulating teacher voices, but also to the ethics of what it is those voices articulate!

We have seen that a world of vision without voice is equally problematic. In this world where purposes are imposed and consensus is contrived, there is no place for the practical judgement and wisdom of teachers; no place for their voices to get a proper hearing. A major challenge for educational restructuring is to work through and reconcile this tension between vision and voice; to create a choir from a cacophony.

## 2. Mandates or Menus?

The paradox of postmodernity is that with the globalization of information, communication and economic life come tendencies and capacities to adapt, respond to and emphasize local and immediate production needs and consumer wants. This move from massification to diversity in economic activity together with the localized and regionalized revitalizations of cultural, ethnic and linguistic identity described in the previous section, have profound implications for knowledge and belief systems and the expertise that rests upon them. What we are witnessing here at the societal level is a shift from a small number of stable singularities of knowledge and belief to a fluctuating, ever changing plurality of belief systems.

Confidence in universalizing, all-encompassing belief systems is in decline. Our growing understanding of the imminence of environmental catastrope on a global scale has seriously undermined our faith in technology as a way of accurately and reliably predicting and controlling our world in the rational pursuit of progress. The spread of information along with the globalization of economies has also threatened beliefs in the scientifically predicted inevitability of socialist transformation, a change both symbolized and stimulated by the collapse of the Berlin Wall. Such meta-theories and meta-narratives of human understanding are in disrepute.[29] Even narrative

knowing itself, as something which seeks to understand the allegedly inherent 'narrative unities' that make up people's lives, has been subjected to vigorous criticism on the grounds that people's lives and biographies are characterized as much by inconsistency, contradiction, and fragmentation as they are by any purported unity.[30]

The movement from vision to voice is therefore being accompanied by a movement from single and relatively stable belief systems to multiple and rapidly shifting ones. This is because of the globalization of information and understanding. It is also occurring because such globalization compresses space and time, leading to an increasing pace of change in the world we seek to know and in our ways of knowing it—a flux which continually threatens the stability and endurance of our knowledge bases, making them irretrivably provisional. In addition, the diversification of knowledge and belief is due to the expansion of travel and of multicultural migration, bringing different belief systems into increasing contact. Lastly, the shift is also due to an ever-tightening and recursive relationship between social research and development, where the social world changes even as we study it, not least as a response to the very inquiries we make of it![31]

This transformation in our ways of knowing in many respects marks a movement from cultures of certainty to cultures of uncertainty. This diminishing credibility of traditional knowledge bases along with declining certainty attached to research expertise has immense implications for education and its restructuring. These implications are expressed in an emerging tension between ***mandates and menus*** as preferred ways of delivering and developing educational improvement. They are tensions that make themselves felt in a number of areas, two of which I will explore here. These are the implementation of new teaching strategies, and the development of different kinds of collegiality.

In teaching strategies as in other areas, a key issue is whether to recognize and sponsor single or multiple versions of excellence; whether to acknowledge only one route to salvation or to concede that many such routes are possible. Many, perhaps most of our reform efforts over recent years have been predicated on single models of excellence. These have been grounded in

and legitimated by the allegedly incontroversible findings of educational research. Madeline Hunter's renowned model of ***Elements of Instruction***, is one example.[32] This model organizes training in effective teaching around closely prescribed principles of 'direct instruction'. For a time, the model was widely adopted and mandated in many American and Canadian school districts, as a required focus for staff training in methods of supposedly 'proven' effectiveness. In many districts, adherence to the model has been used as a basis for teacher evaluation. In at least one district, effective compliance with the model has also been used to evaluate teachers' suitability to be mentors of new entrants to the profession.[33]

Direct instruction has subsequently been criticized on the grounds that it is not universally applicable but effective only in particular settings—especially those emphasizing basic skills;[34] on the grounds that its widespread adoption in a school prejudices the growth of more risk-taking, open-ended teaching strategies;[35] and on the grounds that it fosters dependency and inflexibility among those who use it.[36] It would seem, therefore, that efforts to improve teacher effectiveness, and to implement policies of evaluating and promoting teachers on the basis of their presumed effectiveness, have actually been based not on broad criteria of effectiveness at all but on particular and limited versions of it; indeed on versions that may actually inhibit the growth of effective characteristics and behaviours of other kinds among teachers.

Similar criticisms have been directed at the models of teaching reviewed by Joyce and Weil, and used as a basis for programs of inservice teacher training through peer coaching.[37] In ***Staff Development for Student Achievement***, Joyce and Showers promote strategies of peer coaching to secure the adoption of preferred teaching strategies such as cooperative learning and mastery teaching, whose usefulness and effectiveness are said to be solidly grounded in the findings of educational research.[38] Joyce and Showers' work, which has also been used widely in school systems, has been criticized on the grounds that it undervalues the practical insight and wisdom of teachers and requires teachers to comply with the knowledge, expertise and prescriptions that are the property and prerogative of a small cadre of scientific 'experts'.[39] Robertson sees in their technologically optimistic claims

to scientific certainty, not only an unjustified warrant for bureaucratic intervention in teachers' work, but also an overconfidence in the authority of 'hard research' that has strong gender connotations. As she puts it:

> "One can hear a stereotypically masculine overconfidence when the authors quote Ron Edmonds in their introduction: "We can, whenever and wherever we want, successfully teach all children whose schooling is of interest to us. We already know more than we need to do that." Such certainty and predictability are familiar aspects of a masculine view of reality, as is the dependence on external rather than internal inquiry. The "we" to whom Edmonds is referring is assuredly not classroom teachers; this claim for the power of knowledge and instrumentalism refers only to those whose expertise is validated within hierarchical systems. The authors give no indication that they believe teachers might already know enough to teach more children better, but rather that experts can train teachers in observable and tested behaviours which will produce predicted results."[40]

Reliance on the imposition of singular models of teaching expertise can create inflexibility among teachers and make it hard for them to exercise proper discretionary judgements in their classrooms. It can lead to teacher resistance because of implicit rejections of the worth and value of the rest of a teacher's repertoire, and of the life and the person that has been invested in building it up. It can also lead to an overly narrow focus on particular techniques just when we are beginning to understand that effective instruction in real classroom settings involves teachers' possessing a wide repertoire of teaching strategies which they apply flexibly according to the needs of the child and the moment.

The pathways of educational reform are strewn with the discarded certainties of the past. Reading schemes, language laboratories, programmed learning, even open classrooms—reforms such as these would be appropriate exhibits for any museum of innovation. Today's solutions often become tomorrow's problems. Future exhibits in the museum of innovation could

easily include whole language, cooperative learning or manipulative math. We do not know yet. The point is, our knowledge and understanding of the effectiveness of these methods is often provisional, and contingent on their being used in particular circumstances. Singular models of expertise that rest on an allegedly dependable research base are built on epistemological sand.

> "the search for expertise diverts attention away from the collective search for an improving moral framework for practice. It is a search for individual perfection rather than a search for collective wisdom."[41]

Multiple models of excellence are grounded in and arise from collective wisdom in the community of teachers and other educators (including but not confined to research). They acknowledge the provisional and context-dependent character of the knowledge base of teaching. They respect and leave space for teachers' discretionary judgments in their own classrooms. And by endorsing the possession and application of broad teaching repertoires, they permit gradual and selective adaptation and integration of new approaches without this necessarily implying wholesale rejection of the old.

In addition to all this, multiple models of instructional excellence also foster greater collegiality among teachers by acknowledging that teachers have complementary instructional expertise as a basis for partnership. In a study of elementary teachers' use of preparation time, Wignall and I found that teachers generously acknowledged their colleagues' complementary expertise when it was rooted in subject matter.[42] They readily acknowledged they might need help and could get support in, say, art or physical education or music. They were less likely to acknowledge complementary expertise in classroom management or in styles of instruction, however. This may be because among teachers, there is an easier acceptance of diversity of content and content mastery, than there is acceptance of a legitimate range of alternative teaching styles. For many teachers, to acknowledge expertise in another's teaching style is not to acknowledge the value of another version of teaching, but to defer to someone else's superior skills as a teacher and therefore to cast doubts on the adequacy of one's own. For all these reasons,

multiple models of classroom excellence are to be preferred over singular ones. Menus from which to choose are to be preferred to mandates which have to be implemented.

A second area in which menus should prevail over mandates is that of teacher collaboration and collegiality. Collaborative work among teachers can take many different forms. Teachers can collaborate, for instance, on developing school goals or mission statements. They can collaborate in curriculum and other kinds of planning. They can collaborate through structured systems of help and support in the forms of peer coaching or mentor programs. They can collaborate in systematic inquiry or action research. And they can collaborate in classroom practice through team teaching. Yet, administrative systems sometimes assume or act as if collaboration takes only one form, then pressurize teachers to adopt it. Mandatory peer coaching, compulsory team teaching, required collaborative planning—measures as inflexible and insensitive as these rest on singular models of collaborative excellence. They fail to recognize the diverse forms that collaborative work can take. They prescribe narrow techniques that may not suit some people or contexts, and lose sight of the broader collaborative principle which gave rise to them and which could command wider support. They therefore offend the discretionary judgement of teachers that is at the core of teacher professionalism. Despite administrative rhetorics, mandating specific kinds of collaboration is not empowering but disempowering.

Where such singular models of collaborative excellence are adopted, what transpires is what I have elsewhere called ***contrived collegiality***:[43] a form of collaboration which is forced rather than facilitated, which meets the implementation needs of bureaucratic systems rather than the development needs of teachers and schools, which is designed to be administratively predictable rather than unpredictable in its outcomes, and which, as a result might be viewed as stereotypically male rather than female in its style of operation. ***Collaborative*** teacher ***cultures***, meanwhile, comprise many different and interconnected forms of collaborative work, some quite informal; they offer teachers high discretion over the kinds of collaborative work with which they want to be involved; they evolve more slowly around the trust and patience that is needed to build supportive relationships; and

because of the levels of teacher involvement and control, they are more unpredictable in terms of their specific outcomes. This can cause particular difficulty for bureaucratic and hierarchical systems of administration seeking to incorporate collaborative work into existing systems of administrative control.

Putting menus before mandates means not forcing through one particular approach. It means developing awareness of, commitment to and experience in the general collaborative principle. Administratively, it is important to commit to the collaborative principle, but to empower teachers to select from the wide range of practices the ones that suit them best. However, while commitment to collaboration is important, over-commitment or compulsion can be damaging. Increasing the commitment to collaborative work and having most teachers try some aspect of it is probably vital. But working for a 100% adoption rate is unrealistic and undesirable. Most teachers will plan or teach some things better alone than together. And there are some who teach better entirely alone. The solitary mode has its place.[44]

Not all individualistic teachers are weak teachers. A few are strong, even excellent classroom practitioners. They may be eccentric, Prima Donna-ish, difficult to work with as colleagues, but skilled in their own classrooms nonetheless. The idiosyncratic excellence of such teachers should not be punished in pursuit of the collegial norm.

While commitment to collaboration is important, therefore, it should not be pursued with administrative and ideological inflexibility. Above all else, even above collaboration, respect for teacher discretion is paramount, providing this does no harm to students. This is why menus should prevail over mandates. The struggle in making that choice is ultimately a struggle for professional, discretionary control among the community of teachers at school level, against the retention and reconstruction of bureaucratic control by administrators and their systems.

## 3. Trust in People or Trust in Processes?

In the struggle between bureaucratic control and personal empowerment that marks the transition to postmodernity, collaborative relationships and the particular forms they take are central. Such relationships, I have argued, can help give vent to the voice of the people, or they can contribute to the reconstitution of central control. They are at the core of the restructuring agenda and all its contradictory possibilities.

A pervasive theme that runs throughout the literature of shared leadership and collaborative cultures is the truism of trust. The establishment of trust, it is argued, is essential to the buildup of effective and meaningful collaborative work relationships. For Lieberman and colleagues, "trust and rapport.... are the foundation for building collegiality in a school."[45] Louden, for instance, describes the importance of trust in the establishment of a collaborative relationship between himself as a researcher, and the teacher with whom he worked.

> "the trust we developed was quite personal in character. We found that we liked each other, we became friends and the project became more than a piece of work for both of us. I enjoyed working with Johanna and participating in the life of the school, she liked having me around and hoped my study would go well."[46]

The value of such trust in collaborative working relationships is so widely acknowledged and understood that we rarely probe more than superficially into its meaning and nature. One exception is Nias and her colleagues who note that "to talk of trust as if it explained everything is... to make it into a 'black box', an abstract word packed with individual meanings."[47] They argue that trust has two dimensions—predictability and common goals. "For trust to exist," they argue, "people must find one another highly predictable and share substantially the same aims."[48] To paraphrase Nias, et.al., we might say that trust is a process of personal and predictable mutuality.

This understanding of trust and the social-psychological heritage from which it springs certainly helps illuminate our understanding of the dynamics of interpersonal relationships in the context of small group collaboration. But it is an understanding that does not illuminate all forms of trust; only trust in particular circumstances. These are ones of interpersonal relationships that remain relatively stable and persistent over time. As Giddens observes, however, there are also other variants of trust. These can be found in contexts where interpersonal relationships are much less stable and persistent over time. Giddens alludes to these contrasts in his core definition of trust.

> "Trust may be defined as confidence in the reliability of a person or system, regarding a given set of outcomes or events, where that confidence expresses a faith in the probity or love of another, or in the correctness of abstract principles."[49]

Trust, in other words, can be invested in persons or in processes—in the qualities and conduct of individuals, or in the expertise and performance of abstract systems. It can be an outcome of meaningful face-to-face relationships, or a condition of their existence.

The movement from small and simple to massified and modernistic societies, brought with it transformations in the forms of trust that were dominant in people's lives. These transformations can be seen particularly clearly in the changing relationships between these two things. There is a reciprocal relationship between trust and risk. In simple societies, risk was associated with permanent danger; with threats of wild beasts, marauding raiders, famines and floods. Personal trust in family, friends and community helped people cope with these persistent risks. Risk in simple societies was something to be minimized or avoided. In modern, mass organizations and societies, risk and trust took on different qualities. In modern, mass secondary schools, for instance, there were often too many adults to know everyone well. Personnel could change frequently, including leaders. Trust in individuals was no longer sufficient. When key individuals left or leaders moved on, exclusive reliance on personal trust could cause massive instability. In part, these sorts of problems in societies of growing industrial

complexity explained the rise of and constituted a persuasive case for bureaucratic forms of organization. Advancing change and complexity led to a decline in traditional forms of authority. Even innovative schools spearheaded by charismatic leaders often reverted to mediocrity when they left. In modern, mass societies and organizations, another kind of trust was therefore called for: trust in processes and abstract systems.

Tragically and ironically, though, as Max Weber's work reveals so clearly, the iron grip of modern bureaucracy simply perverted the course of system trust.[50] Predictability turned into inflexibility. Relationships and responsiveness became strangulated by rules and regulations. Once they had grown and become established, modern bureaucratic organizations became too inflexible and self-serving to respond to local circumstances and changing needs. The interests of persons were blocked by the inertia of procedure. Trust in impersonal authority and technical expertise therefore declined. Confidence in abstract principles was undermined.

Modern secondary schools, for instance, were and still are criticized for being vast bureaucratic organizations unable to build a sense of community, to secure loyalty and attachment among their students, and to be responsive to the changing social world around them. Secondary schools, that is, were an integral part of the malaise of modernity. Similarly, prevailing patterns of educational change and reform have been criticized for their top-down, standardized, bureaucratic application across entire systems in ways that neglect the purposes and personalities of individual teachers and the context in which they work.

The transition from modernity to postmodernity marks the emergence of new kinds of process trust along with the reconstruction of more traditional kinds of personal trust. In postmodern societies, the form and articulation of corporate activity changes from the large mass factory to smaller, dispersed centres of enterprise, connected by rapid communications and efficient means for processing information. These developments give rise to two important trends in the reconstruction of trust.

First, there is the reconstruction of personal trust. There is extensive and increasing advocacy in the corporate and educational worlds for making the local unit of enterprise more meaningful to those working within it and more empowered to respond to the needs of its local environment. Emphasis is placed on the reconstruction of intimacy, warmth and personal trust in the building of rewarding and also productive collaborative work relationships. With these ends in view, many school districts have initiated programs of school-based management. Large and impersonal secondary schools are also looking increasingly generously at the possibilities for creating smaller, self-contained mini-schools or sub-schools within them that are more meaningful and self-determining for students and teachers alike.[51]

This reinvention of personal trust is double-edged, however. Personal trust can build loyalty, commitment and effectiveness in the enhanced capacity that comes from shared decision-making. But it can also reintroduce problems of paternalism and dependency that characterized traditional forms of authority and organization. Indeed, a number of writers have noted that what appear to be collaborative school cultures appear to prosper most in smaller organizations under conditions of exceptionally strong leadership of a personalized nature.[52] As Acker notes, this can transform internal collective confidence into collective complacency, carrying with it reduced capacity and willingness to network and learn from other kinds of expertise from outside that are not grounded in immediate and trusted personal relationships.[53] Too much reliance can be placed on the principal to be responsible for external linkages.

Exclusive reliance on personal trust and the forms of collaboration that are built upon it can lead to paternalism and parochialism, then. Additional trust in expertise and processes helps postmodern organizations develop and solve problems on a continuing basis in an environment where problems and challenges are continuous and changing. Processes to be trusted here are ones that maximize the organization's collective expertise and improve its problem-solving capacities. These include improved communication, shared decision-making, creation of opportunities for collegial learning, networking

with outside environments, commitment to continuous inquiry and so on. Trust in people remains important, but trust in expertise and processes supersedes it. Trust in processes is open-ended and risky. But it is probably essential to learning and improvement.

This means that in postmodern school systems, risk is something to be embraced rather than avoided. Risk-taking fosters learning, adaptability and improvement. The trust it presumes may need to extend beyond the close interpersonal understandings that make up the collaborative cultures described earlier. These understandings and cultures are important, especially in smaller schools and teams. But larger and more rapidly changing schools require teachers who can invest trust in processes too; who can trust their colleagues provisionally, even before they know them well. This is not to advocate contrived collegiality, which can substitute managerial tricks for organizational trust. But it is to advocate a kind of trust that extends beyond the deep knowledge of interpersonal relationships.

The establishment of trust is central to the restructuring of education. The challenge of trust is to reconstruct collaborative working relationships among close colleagues that enhance personal meaning without reinforcing paternalism and parochialism. It is also the challenge of building confidence and connectedness among teachers who may not know each other quite so well, by investing mutual trust in complementary expertise -- without this also leading to burgeoning bureaucracy. The challenge of trust is one of restructuring and ultimately choosing between enhancing genuine empowerment or reconstructing administrative control.

## 4. Structure or Culture?

A fourth tension in educational restructuring and the way it is organized is that between ***structure*** and ***culture*** as a proper focus for change. This tension is highlighted by Werner in an incisive analysis of recent restructuring efforts within the province of British Columbia in Canada. Werner refers to the provincial minister's call in 1989 for "a fundamental restructuring of the provincial curriculum with a focus on the development

of problem solving and creative thinking".[54] This proposed restructuring included an ungraded primary curriculum, an integrated, common curriculum; and a strengthening of assessment and accountability procedures.

Werner dismisses the proposed restructuring for British Columbia as "a classic curriculum fix", reflecting a pervasive and deep-rooted belief in the power of curriculum reform to secure effective change (especially if supported by some inservice training and supervision). Against this structural orientation to change, Werner, drawing on a submission by the British Columbia Principals' and Vice-Principals' Association, suggests an alternative strategy: "...to encourage teacher development, strengthen school culture, and build upon those good practices already in place in schools".[55] In effect, Werner supports the strategy of improving schools from within rather than reforming them from without. More significant than centralized control of curriculum development and implementation, he argues,

> "...will be groups of teachers who search out and discuss ways to better understand and organize their programs, and who take action in and within the structure of their own schools."

Werner's concern is that despite rhetorics of empowerment along with an appearance of devolving power to teachers by giving them more responsibility for planning and organizing curriculum integration, the British Columbia ministry "retained control of curriculum by strengthening student testing and program evaluation. In essence, this meant that power relations around the curriculum would change little."[56]

What is being counterposed here by Werner are politically popular ***structural*** solutions to educational change against less fashionable but more enduring and effective ***cultural*** ones. The contrast is a striking and persuasive one. Structural changes of the sort initially proposed for British Columbia underestimate the traditions, assumptions and working relationships that profoundly shape existing practice. Consequently, they also overestimate the power of structural changes to alter such practice, even with the support of inservice training for teachers. The image is of a powerful,

determining structure acting on a relatively malleable body of practice. The important thing about change here is therefore to get the structures right so they support your educational goals, then have practice conform to them.

The cultural view, by contrast, sees existing practice as heavily determined by deeply-rooted beliefs, practices and working relationships among teachers and students that make up the culture of the school and the traditions of the system. In this pattern of deep cultural determination, structural reforms are perceived as small, transient and ineffective: little match for the power of the existing culture. Change, in this view, is brought about by acting on and supporting the culture itself so that teachers are more able to make change as a community in the interests of the students they know best. Promotion of change in this cultural view is achieved by what Werner has elsewhere called policy support strategies--ones which create release time for teachers to work together, assist them in collaborative planning, encourage teachers to try new experiences (like a new practice or grade level), involve teachers in goal-setting, create a culture of collaboration, risk and improvement, and so on.[57]

While there are growing indications that deep cultural changes of this sort are much more likely to be effective in improving classroom practice than quick structural fixes, there are nevertheless limits to the effectiveness and applicability of Werner's cultural model. Werner's writing, like a good deal of other writing on teacher development and the culture of the school, treads a fine line between respecting the beliefs and perspectives of teachers and romanticizing them. In the quest for collaborative professional development and improvement, the inherent generosity and altruism of all teachers cannot always be presumed. Teachers' beliefs and practices are grounded not only in expertise and altruism, but also in structures and routines to which they have become attached and in which considerable self-interest may be invested. Such structures, we have seen, have often evolved historically to meet political and moral purposes that are very different from those which many of us would now consider important. Effective teacher development in the building of collective improvement therefore depends on more than the release of moral virtue. It also depends on controlling vested interests. For example, stronger forms of collegiality in the teacher

work culture may require modifications to the subject-specialist, departmentalized secondary school curriculum that currently isolates teachers from many of their colleagues and ties them to the balkanized domain of departmental politics and self-interest.[58]

In some cases, therefore, especially in larger secondary schools, it is not possible to establish productive school cultures without prior changes being effected in school structures that increase the opportunities for meaningful working relationships and collegial support among teachers. The importance of the structural option of restructuring, therefore, may be less in terms of its direct impact on curriculum, assessment, ability grouping and the like, than in terms of how it creates improved opportunities for teachers to work together on a continuing basis. The challenge of restructuring along the lines of changed power relationships proposed by Sarason, therefore, is not one of choosing between structure and culture as targets of reform. Nor is it one of 'managing' school cultures so that teachers cheerfully comply with structural goals and purposes already fixed by the bureaucratic centre. Rather, it is a challenge of redesigning school structures away from nineteenth and early twentieth century models so as to help teachers work together more effectively as a community in collaborative cultures of positive risk and continuous improvement. As an essential precondition for productive interaction, this much at any rate may need to be mandated!

## Conclusion

Restructuring, I have argued, has no single, agreed definition. Its meaning, rather, is to be found in the context and purpose of its use. In the centralization of curriculum change and assessment demands, where restructuring is a camouflage for reform, it can support intensification of bureaucratic control. Strong, singular visions and imposed, inflexible mandates--these are the stuff of such control. Equally though, restructuring can also propel us into a world of postmodern indeterminacy and ephemerality--into a cacophony of voices of undistinguished moral validity, without any common vision or purpose: a world in which the decision-making power invested in school cultures is arbitrarily shaped by the inertia

of historical tradition and ingrained interest rather than the virtue of collective moral choice.

The challenge of restructuring in education and elsewhere is a challenge of abandoning bureaucratic controls, inflexible mandates, paternalistic forms of trust and quick system fixes in order to hear, articulate and bring together the disparate voices of teachers and other educational partners. It is a challenge of opening up broad avenues of choice which respect teachers professional discretion and enhance their decision-making capacity. It is a challenge of building trust in the processes of collaboration, risk and continuous improvement as well as more traditional kinds of trust in people. And it is a challenge of supporting and empowering school cultures and those involved in them to develop changes themselves on a continuing basis. But in relaxing and relinquishing administrative control, the challenge of restructuring in postmodern times is also one of not losing a sense of common purpose and commitment with it. In trading bureaucratic control for professional empowerment, it is important we do not trade community for chaos as well.

This paper is not a litany of solutions to these complex dilemmas, but has sought to sketch out ways of approaching them. Its purpose has been to show that the resolutions are not ideologically simple but profoundly complex; that they involve more than straight choices between restructuring and reform. Restructuring is not an end to our problems but a beginning. In this paper, I have tried to point to ways in which the concept and practice of restructuring may itself already need to be restructured, if the purposes of professionalism and empowerment are to be pursued with seriousness and integrity.

## References


1 Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*, Report of the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Forum, 1986.

2 See Rudduck, J. "Accrediting teacher education courses: The new criteria." In Hargreaves, A. and Reynolds, D. (Eds.), *Education Policies: Controversies and Critiques*. Philadelphia: Falmer Press, 1989, 178-190.

3 For a more extended discussion of the impact of National Curriculum reform on teacher development, see Hargreaves, A., *Curriculum and Assessment Reform*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1989.

4 For evidence and examples, see Hargreaves, A. and Dawe, R. Paths of professional development: Contrived collegiality, collaborative culture, and the case of peer coaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 6, No. 3, 1990, 227-241; Smyth, J. and Garman, N. Supervision as school reform: A critical perspective. *Journal of Education Policy*, Vol. 4, No. 4, 1989, 343-361; and Popkewitz, T. & Lind, K. Teacher incentives as reforms: Teachers' work and the changing control mechanism in education. *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 90, No. 4, Summer 1989, 575-594.

5 Reported in O'Neil, J. Piecing together the restructuring puzzle. *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 47, No. 7, April 1990, 4-10.

6 Tyack, D. Restructuring in historical perspective: Tinkering toward utopia. *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 192, No. 2, Winter 1990, 170-191.

7 Murphy, J. & Everston, C. (Eds.), *Restructuring Schools: Capturing the Phenomena*. New York: Teachers' College Press, 1991.

8 National Governors' Association, *Results in Education, 1989*, N.G.A., Washington, D.C., 1989.

9 See, for instance, Schlechty, P. *Schools for the Twenty-First Century*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

10 Sarason, S., *The Predictable Failure of Educational Reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

11 See the collection of papers in *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, Vol. 12, No. 3, Fall 1990.

12 Sarason, *op. cit*, note 10, p. 5

13 Schlechty, *op cit*, note 9.

14 Ibid, p. 39

15 Ibid, pp. 14-15.

16 A point made by Fleming, T., Canadian school policy in liberal and post-liberal eras: Historical perspectives on the changing social context of schooling 1846-1990. *Journal of Education Policy*, forthcoming, 1991.

17 See, for instance, Harvey, D., *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Polity Press, 1989; Menzies, H., *Fast Forward and Out of Control: How Technology is Changing our Lives*. Toronto: MacMillan, 1989; Naisbett, J. and Aberdene, P. *Megatrends 2000*. New York: William Morrow, 1990; Giddens, A., *The Consequences of Modernity*. Oxford: Polity Press, 1990. The ensuing account of the developments in postmodernity at the societal level, draws on these sources.

18 Goodson, I. Nations at risk and national curriculum: Ideology and identity. In *Politics of Education Association Yearbook*. Taylor and Francis Ltd., 1990, pp. 219-252.

19 Goodson, *op cit*, p. 220.

20 Ibid, p. 221.

21 Gilligan, C., *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, Mass., 1982.

22 Harvey, *op cit*, note 17, p. 48

23 Elbaz, F. Research on teachers' knowledge. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 1, 1991, p. 10.

24 Goodson, I. Sponsoring the teacher's voice. In Hargreaves, A. and Fullan, M. (Eds.), *Understanding Teacher Development*. London: Cassell and New York: Teachers' College Press, 1991.

25 Achilles, C. M. A vision of better schools. In Greenfield, W. (Ed.), *Instructional Leadership: Concepts, Issues and Controversies*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1987, p. 18.

26 Deal, T. and Peterson, K. Symbolic leadership and the school principal: Shaping school cultures in different contexts. Unpublished paper, Vanderbilt University, 1987, p. 14- .

27 Hello cruel world: Claude Taylor fought for a decade for privatization. Now he confesses, Air Canada wasn't ready. *The Globe and Mail Report on Business*, Vol. 7, No. 8, February 1991, p. 36.

28 Leithwood, K. and Jantzi, D. Transformational leadership: How principals can help reform school culture. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, Boston, MA., April 1990.

29 See Harvey, *op cit*, note 17 for a development of this.

30 Willinsky, J. Getting personal and practical with personal and practical knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry*, Vol. 9, No. 3, Fall 1989, pp. 247-264.

31 On this point, see Giddens, A., *op cit*, note 17.

32 Hunter M. Knowing, teaching and supervising. In Hosford, P. (Ed.), *Using What We Knew About Teaching*. Alexandria, VA., Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984, pp. 169-192.

33 See Popkewitz and Lind, *op cit*, note 4.

34 See Hallinger, P. and Murphy, J. Instructional leadership in the school context. In Greenfield, W. (Ed.), *Instructional Leadership: Concepts, Issues and Controversies*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1987, 179-203.

35 See the articles in the issue of *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, Vol. 12, No. 3, Fall 1990, *op cit*, note 11.

36 Garman, N. and Smyth, J., *op cit*, note 4.

37 Joyce, B. and Weil, M. *Models of Teaching* 3rd Edition. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1986.

38 Joyce, B. and Showers, B. *Student Achievement Through Staff Development*. New York: Longman, 1988.

39 Hargreaves, A. and Dawe, R., *op cit*, note 4.

40 Robertson, H. Teacher development and gender equity. In Hargreaves, A. and Fullan, M. (Eds.), *Understanding Teacher Development*. London: Cassells and New York: Teachers' College Press, 1991.

41 Olson, J. *The Concept of the Expert and its Limitations for Understanding Practice*. Nordisk Pedagogik, Forthcoming, 1991.

42 Hargreaves, A. and Wignall, R. *Time for the Teacher: A Study of Collegial Relations and Preparation Time Among Elementary School Teachers*. Final research report. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1989.

43 Hargreaves, A. Contrived collegiality: A micropolitical analysis. In Blase, J. (Ed.), *The Politics of Life in Schools*. New York: Sage, 1991.

44 This argument is developed in Hargreaves, A. Individualism and individuality: Reinterpreting the culture of teaching. *International Journal of Educational Research*. Forthcoming, 1991.

45 Lieberman, A., Saxl, E. R., and Miles, M. B. Teachers leadership: Ideology and practice: In Lieberman, A. (Ed.), Building a Professional Culture in Schools. New York: Teachers College Press, pp. 148-166.

46 Louden, W. *Understanding Teaching*. London: Cassell and New York: Teachers' College Press, forthcoming, 1991.

47 Nias, J., Southworth, G. and Yeomans, A. *Staff Relationships in the Primary Schools*. London: Cassell, 1989, p. 78.

48 Ibid, p. 81.

49 Giddens, A. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Oxford: Polity Press, 1990, p. 34, from whom much of the following account of trust and risk is drawn.

50 Weber, M. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittoch (Eds.). New York: Bedminster Press, 1968.

51 For accouant of these development, see Hargreaves, A. and Earl, L., *Rights of Passage*. Toronto: Queen's Printer, 1990.

52 See Nias, et al, *op cit*, note 48, for example.

53 Acker, S. *It's what we do already but...Primary teachers and the 1988 Education Act*. Paper presented at a conference on Ethnography, Education and Policy, St. Hilda's College, Oxford, September 1989.

54 Werner, W. Defining curriculum policy through slogans. *Journal of Education Policy*, Vol. 6, No. 2, Forthcoming, 1991.

55 Werner, *op cit*, p.

56 Ibid, p.

57 Werner, W., *Evaluating Program Implementation (School Based)*. Final Project Report, Centre for the Study of Curriculum Instruction, Vancouver, University of British Columbia, 1982.

58 See Hargreaves, A., Cultures of teaching: A focus for change. In Hargreaves, A. and Fullan, M. (Eds.), *Understanding Teacher Development*. London: Cassell and New York: Teachers' College Press, 1991 and Fullan, M. and Hargreaves, A., *What's Worth Fighting For?: Working Together for your School*. Toronto: Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation, 1991.